REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-25 are pending in the Application.
- Claims 1-25 are rejected by Examiner.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 23 is rejected under 35 USC §112 second paragraph as being indefinite because there may be two compression steps in referenced Claim 14. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant notes that there is only one element in Claim 14 which contains the referenced term "compressing". The other element is a "generating" step. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 23 is not indefinite because there is no ambiguity as to which "compressing" step is referenced in Claim 14. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §112 second paragraph rejection.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, and 22-24, stand rejected as being anticipated by US Patent Publication 2004/0042554 to Ishizuki et al. (Ishizuki). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Ishizuki discusses a system, such as in Figure 3, where an already encoded real-time stream data is input to a decoder 16 which produces real-time decoded video and audio data that are immediately placed into video input memory 3 and audio input memory 5. This allows the encoder 6 to apply a first level of encoding to the now-decoded content of video memory 3 and audio memory 5. The purpose of this decode-then-encode step using memory 3 and 5 (which is shared by the decoder 6 and encoder 16) is described in paragraph 0058 and 0059 of Ishizuki. The reasons include to prevent the influences of the frame synchronization (the image frames skipped or repeated, the abnormal

sound, etc.) from being included in the outgoing stream of the encoder 6 during the processing (or transcoding) of the incoming coded stream by the decoder 16, while preventing the underflow condition and overflow condition of the video and audio output memories 13 and 15. Also, the configuration of Figure 3 does not require the phase adjustment unit which corrects completely the phase difference between the transmitting-side clock and the receiving-side clock.

Applicant notes that the system of Figure 3 of Ishizuki contains only one level of encoding. Likewise, Figure 5 of Ishizuki also has only one level of encoding. In Figure 5, the digital video stream input into the DV decoder 16B is decoded into audio and video portions which are stored in video input memory 3 and audio input memory 5. The video and audio data stored in memories 3 and 5 are provided to MPEG2 encoder 6A which provides a first level of encoding.

Applicant notes that pending independent Claim 1 recites:

An apparatus for compressing media content in an electronic device having a video capture device for capturing the video content, comprising:

a real-time, Low Complexity (LC) video compressor for compressing the video content into an LC encoded bit stream in real-time; and

a non-real-time High Complexity (HC) video compressor for generating an HC encoded bit stream from the LC encoded bit stream in non-real-time.

Applicant observes that Ishizuki does not teach a first level of real time low complexity encoding followed by a second level of non-real time high complexity encoding because Ishizuki teaches only a single level of encoding after a decoding function.

Independent Claim 14 has similar elements that express a low complexity compression followed by a high complexity compression which is absent in the teachings of Ishizuki.

Since Ishizuki fails to teach all of the elements of independent Claims 1 and 14 upon which dependent Claims 2-5, 10-12, 13-17, and 22-24 rely, then

Ishizuki cannot anticipate Claims 1-5, 10-12, 13-17, and 22-24 under 35 USC §102(b) per MPEP 2131.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC§102(b) rejection of Claims 1-5, 10-12, 13-17, and 22-24 per the discussion of the cited prior art above.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 6 stands rejected as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2004/0042554 to Ishizuki et al. (Ishizuki) in view of US Patent Publication No 2005/0169377 to Lin et al. (Lin). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The teachings of Ishizuki are discussed above. Lin teaches a low-complexity spatial downscaling video transcoder. The spatial downscaling video transcoder integrates the DCT-domain decoding and downscaling operations in the downscaling CDDT into a reduced-resolution DCT-MC so as to achieve significant reduction of computations without any quality degradation.

However, like Ishizuki, Lin fails to teach or suggest a real-time, Low Complexity (LC) video compressor for compressing the video content into an LC encoded bit stream in real-time; and a non-real-time High Complexity (HC) video compressor for generating an HC encoded bit stream from the LC encoded bit stream in non-real-time as recited in independent Claim 1 upon which Claim 6 depends.

Since the combination of Ishizuki and Lin fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 1 which supports dependent Claim 6, then Claim 6 cannot be rendered obvious by the cited combination under 35 USC §103(a) per MPEP §2143.03.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC§103(a) rejection of Claim 6.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 7-9 and 18-21 stand rejected as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2004/0042554 to Ishizuki et al. (Ishizuki) in view of an article entitled "H.264 and MPEG-4 Video Compression" by Richardson (Richardson). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The teachings of Ishizuki are discussed above. Richardson teaches H.264/MPEG Part 10 encoding. However, like Ishizuki, Richardson fails to teach or suggest a real-time, Low Complexity (LC) video compressor for compressing the video content into an LC encoded bit stream in real-time; and a non-real-time High Complexity (HC) video compressor for generating an HC encoded bit stream from the LC encoded bit stream in non-real-time as recited in independent Claim 1 upon which Claims 7-9 depends or as recited in independent Claim 14 upon which Claims 18-21 depend.

Since the combination of Ishizuki and Richardson fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent Claims 1 and 14 which supports dependent Claims 7-9 and 18-21 respectively, then dependent Claims 7-9 and 18-21 cannot be rendered obvious by the cited combination under 35 USC §103(a) per MPEP §2143.03.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the USC§103(a) rejection of Claims 7-9 and 18-21.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13 and 25 stand rejected as being unpatentable over US Patent Publication 2004/0042554 to Ishizuki et al. (Ishizuki) in view of US Patent No 7,420,482 to Henry et al. (Henry). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The teachings of Ishizuki are discussed above. Henry teaches play back of an audiovisual or audio document received in a first encoding format within a local area network. A first device plays back the document in the received format, then a user decides to play back the document on a device having a second encoding format. Playback is first stopped on the first device and the

document is stored. The user starts playing back the document on the second device at the moment at which playback of it was stopped on the first device. Depending on the decoding means of the second device, the document is transcoded from the first encoding format to the second encoding format. Henry teaches the use of two devices.

However, like Ishizuki, Henry fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of a single video capture device that compresses, in real-time, video content into an Low Complexity (LC) encoded bit stream; and then generates, in non-real-time, an HC encoded bit stream from the LC encoded bit stream as recited in independent Claims 1 and 14 upon which Claims 13 and 25 depend respectively.

Since the combination of Ishizuki and Henry fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of independent Claims 1 and 14 which support dependent Claims 13 and 25 respectively, then dependent Claims 13 and 25 cannot be rendered obvious by the cited combination under 35 USC §103(a) per MPEP §2143.03.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the USC§103(a) rejection of Claims 13 and 25.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentably define over the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration for a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefore.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 21, 2011   /Jerome G Schaefer/

_____

Jerome G. Schaefer
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,800
(609) 734-6451

Thomson Licensing, LLC
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312